

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

GERALDINE A. TRICE, ) Case No. 2:16-cv-01348-MMD-NJK  
Plaintiff(s), ) ORDER  
vs. ) (Docket No. 37)  
JAMIE DAMION, et al., )  
Defendant(s). )

---

Pending before the Court is a motion to stay filed by some Defendants. Docket No. 37. The motion seeks a stay pending resolution of various pending dispositive motions. *See id.*<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff did not file a response to the motion to stay. The Court finds the matter properly resolved without oral argument. *See* Local Rule 78-1. For the reasons discussed below, the motion to stay is hereby

**GRANTED.**

The Court has broad discretionary power to control discovery. *See, e.g., Little v. City of Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988). “The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending.” *Tradabay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011). The party seeking a stay carries the heavy burden of making a strong showing why discovery should be denied. *See, e.g., Turner Broadcasting Sys., Inc. v. Tracinda*

---

<sup>1</sup> The other appearing defendants have joined in some of those dispositive motions. *See* Docket Nos. 12, 19.

*Corp.*, 175 F.R.D. 554, 556 (D. Nev. 1997). The case law in this District makes clear that requests to stay all discovery may be granted when: (1) the pending motion is potentially dispositive; (2) the potentially dispositive motion can be decided without additional discovery; and (3) the Court has taken a “preliminary peek” at the merits of the potentially dispositive motion and is convinced that the plaintiff will be unable to state a claim for relief. *See Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013).<sup>2</sup>

Having reviewed the underlying motions to dismiss, the Court finds that these elements are met in this case and **GRANTS** the motion to stay discovery. If the motions to dismiss are not granted in full, the parties shall file a proposed discovery plan within seven days of the issuance of the order resolving the first motion to dismiss that is decided.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 26, 2016

**NANCY J. KOPPE**  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>2</sup> Conducting this preliminary peek puts the undersigned in an awkward position because the assigned district judge who will decide the motion to dismiss may have a different view of its merits. *See Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. at 603. The undersigned’s “preliminary peek” at the merits of that motion is not intended to prejudice its outcome. *See id.*